DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 471 FL 007 346

AUTHOR Trifonovitch, Gregory J.
TITLE Roots of Bilingual/bicultural Education in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Topics in Culture Learning, Vol. 3.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. East-West Center.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 13p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Director, Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 (no charge)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Chamorro; *Educational Policy; *English (Second Language); Language Instruction; *Malayo Polynesian Languages; Non English Speaking; Official Languages; Second Language Learning; Social Attitudes; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Micronesia

ABSTRACT

This article reviews the history of bilingual-bicultural education in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The U.S. government has administered the area since 1945. The original educational policy called for bilingual education with use of the local languages at the elementary level, but implementation was hampered by budget limitations. Native Micronesians also felt they were being discriminated against by not receiving sufficient English instruction. Other problems included the choice of an orthography for the native languages (each of which is briefly described), development of extension materials, the fact that not all native languages belonged to the same language families, and resistance on the part of the American staff to learning the local languages. Despite arguments in favor of native language literacy, English was eventually introduced in the first grade. The local languages were reintroduced into elementary education in 1967, and the arrival of the Peace Corps volunteers in 1968 markedly affected both attitudes toward local languages and implementation of the policy. The 1968 Pacific Language Development Project helped develop dictionaries, orthographies, and grammars. Increased Trust Territory administration budgets and federal legislation in support of bilingual-bicultural education finally led to the implementation of policies that had existed since 1945. (CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116471

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
East-West Center
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

ROOTS OF BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

GREGORY J. TRIFONOVITCH
SENIOR PROGRAM OFFICER
CULTURE LEARNING INSTITUTE
EAST-WEST CENTER

In the last four of five years a great interest has developed in the area of bilingual and bicultural education. The U.S. federal government appropriated large sums of money to fund pilot and experimental projects in this field. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has recently become the recipient of some of these funds and now has several experimental projects in Bilingual/Bicultural education. The purpose of this study is to trace the development of the interest in this specific area of education in the Trust Territory. Another purpose is to make key points available heretofore unpublished in Trust Territory memoranda. Hence I will cite liberally from those documents.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is an area composed of over 2,100 islands of which about 100 are inhabited. The Territory is divided into six districts: Mariana, Yap, Palau, Truk, Ponape and the Marshall Islands. It is located north of the equator in the Pacific Ocean between Hawaii to the east and Japan and the Philippines to the west. These islands, which are also known as Micronesia, have been dominated by several major powers, beginning with Spain in the sixteenth century, followed by Germany, Japan and now the United States of America. The United States began to administer this area immediately after the occupation in 1945 when the United Nations placed these islands under the United States trusteeship. (See F. Hezel's article, this volume)

The educational policies established by the United States for Micronesia were in concert with the United Nations Charter. Section 4 of Article 6 of the Trusteeship Agreement stated that the United States would

> "Promote the educational advancement of the inhabitants, and to this end shall take steps toward the establishment of a general system of elementary education; facilitate the vocational and cultural advancement of the population; and shall encourage qualified students to pursue higher education, including training on the professional level." (Meller 1969: 16)

The U.S. Navy Department was the first agency to administer the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (1945-1951). Their education policies, appear to have had a bilingual and bicultural basis.

> Schools shall foster and encourage:
>
> a) The native language, history, arts, and crafts.
>
> b) Instruction in English language to inhabitants of all ages.

FL007346

Elementary Schools shall provide instruction in:

a) English

b) Native language, history, arts, and crafts." (Trifonovitch 1971: 1067)

This policy was indeed a very radical one as contrasted with that of the previous governing powers. The Micronesians had had to learn German to communicate with their first rulers. German, as well as English, was taught by the German administrators to a select group of Micronesian students who attended the German communications school on Yap. Later they found it expedient to learn Japanese, and public free education was non-existent. Education was primarily for Japanese children. The schools were staffed by Japanese teachers who did not speak the local language and made no attempt to do so. Micronesians who were admitted into the Japanese schools had to learn the Japanese language and culture. The educational policies of both the Germans and the Japanese were monolingual and monocultural in nature. The Japanese felt that the local Micronesian languages would soon die out anyway. (Trifonovitch 1971: 1065)

During the American military administration in 1945 to 1951, Isidore Dyen, Arthur Capell, Samuel Elbert and Paulino Cantero suggested orthographies for Yapese, Palauan, Trukese, Marshallese and Ponapean. In 1951 Alfred G. Smith recommended an orthography for Kusaiean and Woleaian, and wrote guides for Marshallese and Trukese spelling. In 1952 Paul Garvin revised the orthography for Ponapean. These linguists were extremely interested in the preservation of the local languages. An example of this interest occurred in 1951 when Saipan and other islands of the Marianas ceased to use Chamorro as the medium of instruction in the schools and replaced it with English. Smith referred to the situation in a memorandum emphasizing that this was in violation of many of the official regulations found in the Charter of the United Nations regarding this territory. To meet these criticisms, he recommended that a training program be conducted on Saipan to train teachers how to teach Chamorro. (Trifonovitch 1971: 1082)

In 1951, after four years of administration by the U.S. Navy, the Trust Territory was turned over to civilian administration under the Department of the Interior. The first civilian Director of Education immediately realized that the education policies as they existed at that time had to be revised if they were to be implemented with any degree of success. The lack of sufficient funds for education hampered the implementation of any policy. Funds were not available to recruit English speaking teachers, and local teachers were not able to teach English. Educational materials and curricula in the local languages were practically non-existent. Lack of funds and the lack of a standardized orthography in the local languages curtailed the development of such materials. In addition, the director of education felt that the teaching of English in the primary grades was pedagogically inadvisable. The director "appointed a committee to study and to help formulate a policy with regard to the relative stress that should be placed on the teaching of the vernacular and English in the schools of the Trust Territory." (Trifonovitch 1971: 1068)

After a complete study the committee made the following recommendations:

"Two languages shall be used in the schools of the Trust Territory--the vernacular or island language and English. When the child first comes to the elementary school, the program should be taught entirely in the island language.... Later on in the elementary school, as soon as the pupils are ready for it, English can become a subject for study and at the same time the teacher can use it when he talks to his classes." (Gibson 1961a: 1-2)

The language policies of the Trust Territory were revised at the recommendations of the committee. They became more definitive and detailed, but the original intent of a bilingual, bicultural education remained unchanged.

"Education shall foster and participate in the self-development of all individuals and groups in the Trust Territory. It shall help these individuals and groups to enable themselves to solve their own problems effectively. It shall therefore help them to understand themselves and their own languages, history, traditions, industries, arts, and crafts. It shall further help them to solve new problems by providing new instruments as needed. If a problem arises for them in communicating with the world at large or with other parts of the Trust Territory, the instrument for solving such a problem may be English.

Elementary schools shall provide integrated educational programs which shall be designed:

a) to promote the welfare of the community in all the ways and things appropriate to that community;

b) to help the pupils do better what they are already doing: to think more clearly; to communicate more effectively, to maintain their health; to contribute to the welfare of their community;

c) to help pupils do such new things as are meaningful to them: to read and to write; to learn new facts about health and to acquire new health habits; to use arithmetical concepts; to become proficient in arts, crafts, agriculture, and industries; to understand local and world history, geography, and other social matters; to develop habits of scientific inquiry.

Island Languages

Education should start where the pupils start. In a language program the pupils start with their mother tongue. In general, therefore, the medium of instruction in the elementary schools shall be the mother tongue of the pupils, even where that mother tongue is not an official dialect or the official language of the island. Because a person is effectively aided in learning to read and write in a foreign language by ability to read and write his own language, literacy in the mother tongue shall be one prerequisite to instruction aimed at English Literacy. Teaching aids, texts, and other literature in all island languages shall be prepared, preferably as a part of the local school curriculum by teachers and pupils with expert guidance and advice.

English

English is a foreign language in the Trust Territory. It shall, however, be fostered as a second language for the peoples of the Trust Territory wherever the following conditions are fulfilled:

a) a problem in communication is recognized by the people;

b) a command of English is found to be a solution to that problem;

c) literacy in the mother tongue is attained;

d) certified teachers of English are available.

The necessity of deciding when these conditions are fulfilled will be the joint responsibility of the High Commissioner and District Administration.

English shall then be taught as a foreign language. The content and the vocabulary of English studies shall be adjusted to local conditions to make them more meaningful to the pupils. English teaching aids, texts and other literature for teacher's use shall be prepared for each local area as necessary, preferably as a part of the local school curriculum by teachers and pupils and

with expert guidance and advice. Oral competency in English shall be a prerequisite to the development of literacy in English during the first years of English studies." (Gibson 1961a: 2-3)

The same financial limitation which inhibited the implementation of the bilingual education policies during the Naval administration continued during the civil administration in spite of the efforts of the education department to modify its policies. The budget permitted the hiring of only a handful of Americans to serve as advisors and to assist the Micronesians in the development of their own curriculum. Unfortunately, most of the American advisors (and later teachers) were not bilingual or bicultural themselves. They understood and appreciated the educational needs of the Micronesians and endeavored to implement the educational policies. However, they were severely handicapped in their efforts since their own thoughts and patterns of behavior had been so completely influenced by a monolingual, monocultural educational system which propelled them in the same direction. I discussed this problem when reviewing cross-cultural orientation programs for these teachers. (Trifonovitch, 1973)

With the lack of qualified teachers to teach English and other subjects in English the local languages were emphasized in the lower elementary schools, and English was delayed until high school where qualified teachers were available. This issue was further complicated by a misunderstanding on the part of the Micronesian community as to the reason for the delay in the teaching of the English language. They interpreted the policy as a deliberate attempt by the administration to curtail the educational development of the islanders. For example:

"One educator reported an encounter with a village chief in which the chief blamed the American administration for not emphasizing English in the early grades of the elementary schools as a deliberate action TO KEEP MICRONESIANS IN THE BOONDOCKS" (Trifonovitch 1971: 1070)

It is my opinion that this was a general reaction on the part of Micronesians growing out of their earlier educational experience. During the Japanese regime it was clearly evident that there was a deliberate attempt by the administration to establish a selective educational policy and only a very few Micronesians were allowed to attend the Japanese schools. So it was natural for Micronesians to interpret the American delay in teaching English as a policy typical of foreign administrators intended to exclude Micronesians from the benefits of a modern education. An illustration of the pressure exerted by the Micronesian community for English to be used in the schools early is captured by Bender (whose main experiences were in the Marshall Islands). He wrote:

"The Marshallese people want and demand that the teaching of English be maintained in the Public Elementary Schools. This was their response to the suggestion that it be delayed till the pupils enter the Intermediate School.

Why are the Micronesians so desirous of learning English? This question has often been dismissed with this simple answer: 'Prestige value.' Not that this may not be true, but a simple answer is usually not adequate to convey the whole picture. I would like to give a few samples of what the Marshallese usually say when they discussed this problem among themselves:

'Look at all those who are in important positions, all of them speak English. The better one speaks, reads and writes English, the better the job he has. More money too.'

'Why should we rely solely on the translation of a handful of interpreters. These men are like a small pipe controlling the flow of information between the Americans and the Marshallese.'

'Ridiculous, wanting to learn to speak English does not mean that we don't have pride in our own culture.'

'We believe all you have said. The problem is, as I see it, not whether or not English should be taught at all, but where and when? I prefer the teaching of it in the elementary school level because that is all the schooling the great majority of Marshallese will ever have and all Marshallese want to have some understanding of what they hear or read in English.'

'I am so envious when I see you fellows talking to an American, listening to a radio, reading a 'nujpepa' (newspaper or magazine), or a book that I wish I could understand what is going on. Don't ask me why I want to know, I don't know the reasons myself. If I am too old to learn, the children are not. If more funds are not available then stretch the dollars we have. Am I asking for a miracle? Yes, I am. Americans are a people who are constantly making miracles.'" (Bender 1959: 1-2)

The educational administrators in the Trust Territory were placed in a very unenviable position. On the one hand budgetary limitations hampered them from fully implementing a bilingual education program and on the other hand community pressure continued to increase demanding more English in the schools even at the expense of their own native language and culture.

Attempting to answer the problem, the Director of Education, after attending a Regional Educational Seminar held by the South Pacific Commission in 1959, wrote the following summary of two different viewpoints on language policy presented at the meetings:

"The French viewpoint was: The indigenous populations demand that they be given our type of education. They will not accept any watered-down substitutes. If we are to comply with this demand, then we have no time to waste with local languages which will in any case play no further part in the child's education in two, three, or four years, as the case may be. It is our experience, and we have been at this job for many years, that pupils taught in the metropolitan language at the outset are perfectly able, other things being equal, to compete with pupils in our own metropolitan schools at every level. Furthermore, they said, in many territories there are great numbers of indigenous languages, each one spoken by a few thousand people. It is surely unrealistic to attempt to convert these languages into teaching languages.

[The other, contrasting argument]:

"Dr. F. H. Walter, Program Specialist for the teaching of foreign languages, UNESCO, was a proponent of the development and the use in teaching of the existing vernacular language. One argument was a moral one. Native language, he said, the language that a child learns at his mother's knee is man's most cherished possession. It is at once the essence and the vehicle of his culture. He has a right to maintain it and administering powers have a duty not only to help him to maintain it but to help him to develop it in any educational process that is introduced.

The second argument was pedagogical. The child, he said, comes to one of your schools at, say, six years of age and is at once subjected to what is really quite intolerable intellectual burden. You not only confront him with a totally new language, the metropolitan language, which you compel him to start learning at once, but, in addition you make him begin the study of all these new, difficult arts, such as reading and writing and arithmetic, which are in themselves difficult enough for any child, and you make him try to master these arts in the, to him totally unfamiliar medium of the metropolitan language. You would get far better pedagogical results if you let

pupils learn to read and to acquaint themselves with numbers in their own tongue. Later, with proper planning, they will have ample time to master the metropolitan language which should in any case be introduced to them gradually." (Gibson 1961a: 3:5)

The Trust Territory had reflected the latter viewpoint in the policy it was attempting to implement with the assistance of the skeletal staff who had been advocating this philosophy for almost ten years prior to the 1959 South Pacific Conference. This emphasis continued on the local language and culture with the gradual introduction of English into the curriculum.

Nevertheless, the relentless community pressure was eventually bolstered by American educators who with monolingual, monocultural backgrounds opted for the easiest solution--to teach English and in English rather than attempting to learn the local language and assist in preparing local curricula.

In an attempt to meet the demands of the Micronesians to start English in the early elementary grades and to also answer the questions of the American educators, one of the three linguists on the staff wrote the following in 1961:

"The whole letter (letter sent to the Director of Education by the local people) implies an attitude which I have heard expressed in one form or another many times in the Trust Territory. In its simplest form it runs something like this: 'Our English program is not doing the job it should because the Director of Education is deliberately holding us back. Our hands are tied by his unreasonable and perverse refusal to let us teach English in the first grade.' This tendency to view an early start in English as the panacea for all the troubles of the Trust Territory just doesn't fit the facts. If there were even the remotest chance that beginning the teaching of English in the first grade could accomplish all the wonders that are claimed for it, I'd be first to recommend a change in our present policy. But deferring English instruction for a few years as we do...is NOT what is presently wrong with our English program." (Quackenbush 1961: 6)

Finally, the ever increasing local pressure to begin the teaching of English became the concern of the High Commissioner. The Director of Education in his attempts to answer the queries made by the High Commissioner requested the assistance of a prominant linguist, Charles F. Hockett, who agreed with the language policies of the Department of Education and offered the following points for consideration by the High Commissioner in defense of the existing policies. (Hockett's comments are of central importance to this article. He reinforces the language policies, defines the problem, and recommends future developments.)

"There are, however, several related points that need discussion:

1. If English is to be begun in the first grade (when teachers are available), how is the teaching of English as a second language to be worked in alongside of the development of literacy in the first language? I should say that in the first grade the bulk of the time each day should be spent on the 'three r's' in the native language, with special periods each day--not more than two-fifths of the whole school day--devoted to conversational English at the appropriate level. In the second year, the ratio might be reversed; by the fourth year, instruction might be wholly in English. The second or third year would be the time to start teaching the children to read and write in English--in any case, not too soon. It must be granted that time spent on activities in native language is school time lost from learning English--and vice versa. The only true test is the ultimate results. In a bicultural (and bilinguistic) situation, it is all too easy to produce, 'marginal men,' who have no true sense of participation in either culture; the aim, of course, should be to produce people who have a sense of participation in BOTH cultures. It is hard to see how neglect of and contempt for native language can contribute to this goal. Therefore one must simply assume that a somewhat slowed learning of English is more than compensated for by native language literacy.

2. For literacy in native language, what orthography is to be used? The speakers of the language ought to decide this whenever possible--on the basis of suggestions from linguists who know the problems of orthography-formation. In some of the districts there are two, or perhaps more, competing orthographies: one in use by one missionary group, another by another, perhaps a third tentatively being used by the government schools. Not surprisingly, speakers of the language who have been trained to read and write in one orthography are inclined to prefer it to any of the others.

From conversations with Quackenbush (one of the three linguists referred to earlier) I gather that the most serious problems of orthography selection arise where two different mission groups each support their own. In any such case, I recommend the following. Let Governmental authority issue an ultimatum. Say to the mission groups: get together with each other and with native speakers of the language, and choose a single orthography, by such-and-such a deadline, that you will all use from then on. If you can do so, the Government and the Government schools will thereafter use the orthography you have selected. If you cannot, the Department of Education will make a decision, and will require all of you to abide by that decision if you wish to continue your work in the District.

3. If we teach a Micronesian group to read and write its own language, what are they going to read? The long-term answer to this problem is not terribly important: if native literacy proves to be a viable ingredient of native culture, the group will do their own writing. But for an initial period of a good many years, this question ought to be answered with some central guidance. There should be a plan in each language area for selecting materials that ought to be written, printed, and distributed. There should be a central Literature Production Bureau to take care of the detailed work--or possibly, in time, not a central Bureau but a smaller one in each District. A weekly newspaper of some sort, perhaps partly in the District language and partly in English, would in due time be a good idea.

4. How about native literacy in highly divergent dialects or sharply distinct languages within a District? The clearcut case that comes to mind--in the absence of detailed information about the distribution of languages and dialects in the whole Territory--is Kapingamarangi. The language of Kapingamarangi and of one other atoll in the Ponape district is a Polynesian language--and an EASTERN Polynesian language at that!--have only the remotest genetic relationship to the language of Ponape. If Kapingamarangi children are brought up to Ponape and are put into schools in which 'native language' instruction is in the dialect of Ponape, the basic principle of literacy in native language is being violated. They are being taught a second language of highly limited use instead of a second language--English--of very broad value.

This is probably the sort of situation the French participants at the Brisbane conference had in mind. And yet there is no reason to change basic policies. A language spoken by a community of a hundred or so people is just as complex and viable a phenomenon as one spoken by a thousand people or a million. The child works just as hard learning it; it conditions his patterns of thinking and acting just as thoroughly. The benefits of native language literacy are as valid for a tiny speech community as for an enormous one. The basis of planning is unaltered. If economic factors preclude extending a policy to such small speech communities, then one finds the next best policy--say, perhaps, instruction completely in English from the beginning of school. But one abandons the basic policy with regret.

5. To what extent should Stateside personnel in the Territory learn to communicate in the languages of the Territory? People whose duties take them

from one part of the Territory to another have little opportunity to learn any of the Territorial languages. Of those who stay at a District Post for a year or so, we can be sure that very few will have any desire to learn more than a handful of everyday phrases. But it is eminently desirable that more Stateside personnel learn more of the language of their particular district.

One can argue against this on the grounds that if English-speaking personnel learn Trukese or Yapese or the like, the Trukese or Yapese will have less occasion to practice their English and perhaps less motivation for learning their English. This is largely a rationalization, stemming from the fact that Americans are lazy and embarrassed about learning other languages. Actually, there is nothing as encouraging in cross-cultural and cross-language relations as a good healthy quid-pro-quo. If every American on Truk spoke fluent Trukese, things would be better, not worse--communication would be carried on in English much of the time anyway; the Trukese would feel that the Americans were taking on a more reasonable share of the total communicative burden; the Trukese would learn English better. Indeed, the more a teacher of a language is familiar with the native language of his students, the more effectively he can teach. And every American in the Trust Territory is, for better or worse, a teacher.

I know of no culture anywhere in which the participants do not deeply appreciate the efforts of outsiders to learn some of their language. It seems to be almost a universal token of cross-cultural respect. I suppose we should not display the token unless we feel the respect; but if we do not feel the respect we should not be here." (Hockett 1961: 1-5)

The High Commissioner accepted Hockett's recommendations and the already existing language policies were reaffirmed. But the Micronesian desire for more English instruction continued, and with a greatly increased budget in the early sixties, the administration began to respond with a program of building elementary classrooms and houses for American teachers who would be recruited to teach English. The staff member who headed this program toured the districts in 1963 and brought back the following report:

"Considerable feeling expressed on Yap that the local language should be learned by the Americans. The other districts made no point of this. There was almost complete unanimity of feeling that English should be the language of instruction. In no district was any local feeling expressed indicating a desire for instruction in the indigenous language. There appeared to be no local concern that instruction in English would either kill the local language or force undue cultural changes on the people. The feeling was quite strongly expressed by both Micronesians and Americans that English was what was wanted. It appeared that, if English was not pushed to the maximum, the Micronesians would be upset and would protest. The Micronesians seemed to feel that the children would learn the local language at home, and that the schools should concentrate on English. It was recognized that this approach was not feasible in the past, but that now, with the American teachers coming to the islands, every emphasis could be given to instruction in English." (Trace 1963: 5)

The sentiments reported here now found a responsive official in the Office of Territories in Washington D.C., one who could bring considerable pressure on the High Commissioner. He was a native Guamanian who favored an "English only" policy. (He later became the Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory.) Primarily at his instigation the High Commissioner launched the Accelerated School Construction Program referred to above, to provide classrooms and living facilities for American teachers who would make English the medium of instruction beginning with first graders.

To implement the new program over 100 American teachers were hired immediately. Scores more followed shortly. But after four years and hundreds of thousands of dollars the

administration took a hard look at the idealistic objectives of the Accelerated Program and drew some conclusions that forced them to modify the new policies. The new program became a modified one. As of 1967 the basic objective of the language program is that "English shall become the general language for communication and instruction in the Trust Territory" (Administrative Directive No. 67-4).... The local language again was reintroduced into the basic school curriculum. The order stated that the basic principles in language teaching would be:

"1. Elementary school children, starting in grade one, shall be taught to read in their local language.

2. English shall be taught as a second language. The Teaching-English-as-a-Second Language (TESL) Program includes two major areas:

   a. Oral English, and

   b. Literacy in English

3. English shall become the medium of instruction in the schools as soon as the students indicate sufficient evidence of their ability to comprehend other subjects in English." (Mangan 1967)

The administrative order also stated that this "TESL Program as outlined shall be continued for a minimum period of five years (1967-68 through 1971-72)."

It is my opinion that the educational administration of the Trust Territory made a sincere effort to preserve the local language and culture as well as to offer a second language and culture--a bilingual, bicultural education program.

In 1968 with the arrival of the Peace Corps in the Trust Territory, the Micronesians for the first time in their history welcomed to their shores a group of foreigners who spoke their local languages and who knew of their culture and were willing to live with them in their villages and at their own level and style of life. Not only did these new young American volunteers arrive with some knowledge of the local language and culture but they were also trained in the techniques of teaching English as a second language.

This living example of an interest in bilingual and bicultural education as was demonstrated by the Peace Corp volunteers strengthened the existing basic language policy of the Trust Territory and added dignity and respect to the local languages and cultures of the Micronesian islands.

"The Peace Corps has also affected the attitude towards the local languages of this area, since the volunteers are required to learn the local language. Linguists of the University of Hawaii have since conducted a preliminary linguistic analysis and developed lesson materials in Chamorro, Palauan, Yapese, two Carolinian dialects, Trukese, Ponapean, Kusaiean, and Marshallese.

Chamorro is the language of the inhabitants of the Mariana Islands. Most of the Chamorros are bilingual, speaking either English or Japanese in addition to their mother tongue. Many who are over forty speak three languages. Almost all the Carolinians who migrated to Saipan from the central Caroline Islands about eighty years ago are bilingual, speaking both Chamorro and Carolinian. According to Government statistics, about 90% of the population of the Marianas below the age of twenty-five are now conversant in English, and many of these are now literate also.

Yapese is spoken on Yap proper, and several Carolinian languages or dialects are spoken on the outer islands of the district, such as Ulithi, Woleai, Satawal, Ifaluk, Elato and Lamotrek. Many Yapese also speak Ulithian and English. Some speak Japanese and a few German and Palauan.

Palauan is spoken in the Palau District, with the exception of approximately 170 people who live in the southwest islands (Sonsorol, Tobi and Pulo Ana) and who speak two dialects of Carolinian.

Trukese is spoken in the Truk District. Many of the islands have their own local dialects which are not completely mutually intelligible with the other dialects.

Ponapean, Kusaiean, Kapingamarangian and Nukuoroan are the languages spoken in the Ponape District. The dialects spoken on Mokil and Pingelap strain what Dyen has called the language limit in their relation to Ponapean.

Marshallese has two mutually intelligible dialects--the eastern spoken in the Ratak chain and the western spoken in the Ralik chain of the Marshall Islands.

Most young people under the age of twenty-five, at least in the district centers, are now conversant in English also." (Trifonovitch 1971: 1081)

In 1969 the Trust Territory Education Department in cooperation with the East-West Culture Learning Institute and the University of Hawaii, Department of Linguistics and the Pacific Asian Linguistics Institute developed a four-year Pacific Language Development Project. The basic objective of the project was to assist Pacific islanders in the development of standard orthographies, dictionaries and basic grammars of their languages. Participants in this project came from all the districts of the Trust Territory and also from the Republic of Nauru, Fiji and the Gilbert and Ellice Eslands. Various faculty members and advanced students of the University of Hawaii Department of Linguistics are continuing to assist the islanders in the above-mentioned objectives, as well as in the developing of materials and literature in some of the languages, using the newly developed orthographies. The Social Sciences and Linguistics Institute is currently conducting a program in bilingual education for thirty Micronesian educators. And the East-West Culture Learning Institute is continuing its program in bilingual and bicultural materials development and has other programs with components of bilingualism and biculturalism, including its "Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership" project which is conducted annually. Micronesians are well represented in these programs.

The Pacific islanders who have been trained in the above projects are continuing to teach others in their islands as well as developing materials in their languages. (As discussed by Halferty 1974.)

The sharply increased budgets of the Trust Territory administration in the sixties, and the substantial federal legislation in support of bilingual and bicultural education of the seventies which provides additional funds for Trust Territory education, have made it increasingly possible for the Trust Territory Education Department to begin implementing the goals and policies established from the beginning of American involvement in Micronesia at the close of WW II. The level of support now available is such as to make it possible to actually put the policies into practice, so that the results can be given a fair evaluation. It is unfortunate the goal of nurturing and fostering the local languages had to remain little more than a goal for almost two decades.

SOURCES CONSULTED AND CITED

Annual Report of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the Secretary of the Interior. 1965. Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. 1965. Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Bender, Byron W. 1956. Some suggestions for the improvement of English language instruction in Micronesia. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

_____. 1959. Problems of teaching English in the Marshall Islands: An investigation into the feasibility of developing radio broadcasts as an aid in the teaching of English. [Unpublished paper in the author's possession.]

Bender, Byron W. and Gregory J. Trifonovitch. 1965. A manual for teachers of English in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Clyde, Paul H. 1935. Japan's Pacific Mandate. New York, Macmillan.

Fischer, John L. 1961. The Japanese schools for the natives of Truk, Caroline Islands. Human Organization 20/2.83-8. The Society for Applied Anthropology, Ithaca, N.Y.

Fischer, John L. and M. Ann. 1957. The Eastern Carolines. New York, Taplinger.

Gibson, Robert E. 1959a. Community education in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Community Education, National Society for Study of Education.

_____. 1959b. The use of the vernacular and of English in the schools of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Memorandum. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

_____. 1961a. Trust Territory's language policy. Unpublished report. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

_____. 1961b. Teaching of English. Memorandum. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Goooenough, Ward H. 1963. Cooperation in Change. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Halferty, Nancy M. 1974. Bilingual Education in Truk: An Experiment in Cooperation. Micronesian Reporter. Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 17-19.

Hockett, Charles F. 1961. Recommendations on language policy in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and in the Territory of Guam. Unpublished report. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Joseph, Alice, and Veronica E. Murray. 1951. Chamorros and Carolinians of Saipan. Detroit, The Cellar Book Shop.

Kahn, E. J., Jr. 1966. A Reporter in Micronesia. New York, W. W. Norton.

Mangan, Martin P. 1967. Administrative Directive No. 67-4. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan Mariana Islands.

Micronesian Reporter. 1951-68. Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory Publications Office.

Meller, Norman. The Congress of Micronesia. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1969.

National Association of Educational Broadcasters. 1967. A study of educational needs and requirements and plan for meeting them. Washington, D.C., Office of Research and Development.

Oliver, Douglas L., ed. 1951. Planning Micronesia's future. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Quackenbush, Edward M. 1961. Comments on Memorandum for Educational Administrator, Ponape, to Deputy High Commissioner. Memorandum to the Director of Education. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Reddin, Mary E. 1962. Report on the Teachers-Supervisors' Conference. Unpublished report. Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Richard, Dorothy E. 1957a. United States Naval Administration of the Trust Territory. Vol. 1, The wartime military government. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1957b. United States Naval Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Vol. 2, The postwar military government. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1963. United States Naval Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Vol. 3, The Trusteeship period. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

Spoehr, Alexander. 1949. Majuro, a Village in the Marshall Islands. Fieldiana: Anthropology, Vol. 39. Chicago, Natural History Museum.

_____. 1954. Saipan: The Ethnology of a War-Devastated Island. Chicago, Natural History Museum.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. 1966. Congress of Micronesia Laws and Resolutions. Saipan, Mariana Islands, Publications Office.

_____. 1967. Information Handbook, Micronesia: U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Trace, John R. 1963. Report of visits to Trust Territory Districts reaccelerated Education Program. Memorandum. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

_____. 1966. Brief data. Unpublished report. Headquarters Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Trifonovitch, Gregory J. 1965. On teaching reading in the Trust Territory. Unpublished monograph. Saipan, Mariana Islands, Headquarters Department of Education.

_____. 1966a. A program of teaching English as a second language (TESL) in the schools of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Saipan, Mariana Islands, Department of Education.

_____. 1966b. Orientation program. Micronesia Reporter 14/4. Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory Publications Office.

_____. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 8, The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

_____. On Cross-Cultural Orientation Techniques. Topics in Culture Learning, Vol. 1, 1973.

U.S. Navy Department. 1944. Civil affairs handbook, Mandate Mariana Islands. Washington, D.C., Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

_____. 1951. Interim regulations, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Washington, D.C., Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.